App. No.: 10/709243 Page 4 of 5

Filed: April 23, 2004

Conf. No.: 3242

REMARKS

In light of the Office Action and the cited art, claim 1 and certain of the dependent claims have been amended to more fully distinguish over the cited art. Although the references applied appear to represent an approach to the problem solved by this invention, they really do not do so in the context of the entire machine. The foregoing amendment attempts to emphasize this.

In applicants' construction the basic windings are formed around pairs of insulator halves that encircle the pole teeth together. The cited art does not show such a basic construction and the Examiner is most respectfully requested to point out where the references alone or in combination show such a basic construction. Although they show arrangements for facilitating the treatment of the wire ends, the basic structures are quite different.

Specifically the Ames reference does not illustrate or describe a structure where the insulator halves encircle the pole teeth. Rather they engage oppositely facing end surfaces of the pole teeth and thus would permit the individual laminations to become skewed relative to each other about the axis of the machine.

In addition the "wiring base" of this reference is not restrain from like skewing of the wiring base to the coil windings.

The Yamada/ Yamaguchi combination also has its connection to the wiring base made by sliding the elements together in a radial not an axial direction. It is not at all clear what, if anything, prevents movement in the opposite direction for disassembly.

The rejection of claims 1-7 on the Okada et al/ Kikuchi et al combination is also most respectfully traversed. Okada et al, as noted by the Examiner fails to show any wiring base, as such. The elements 14 and 15 are merely insulators attached to opposite axial sides of the windings and through which the wire ends pass rather than having any electrical connection therewith as is claimed herein.

The indicated allowability of claims 8-14, subject to their being rewritten in independent form is noted with appreciation. These claims have not been presently rewritten, due to the foregoing amendment.

App. No.:

10/709243

Filed:

April 23, 2004

Conf. No.:

3242

In view of this favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted:

Ernest A. Beutler Reg. No.19901

> Phone (949) 721-1182 Pacific Time

Page 5 of 5